SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: The scheme of passes to respected freedom fighters comes under the Ministry of Home Affairs, and if we receive such a directive from the Ministry of Home Affairs, we will certainly implement such a directive.

श्रीमती सुधा विजय जोशी : मान्यवर, मैं मंत्री महोदय, से जानना चाहती हूं कि जो महिलाओं की जानी मानी अखिल भारतीय स्तर की संस्थायें हैं, उन संस्थाओं के पदाधिकारियों को पासिज दिये जाते थे, लेकिन आजकल यह पासिज नहीं दिये जाते, तो इसका कारण क्या है ?

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: Sir, actually, one pass has been issued to the General Secretary of the National Federation of Indian Women. This is what I have been able to read immediately from the list. But, Sir, as you know, in 1981 as many as 400 to 500 passes had been issued, and, I think, at that time on certain suggestions received from various quarters inculding some cancelled, and now they are given on a very selected and a very limited way. There are only 54 such passes valid as of today.

श्रीमती सुधा विजय जोशी : सलेक्ट में एक ही संख्या आ जाती है ? . . (व्यवधान)

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: Because they are being given in such a limited manner, that is why, all organisations obviously cannot be accommodated within the scheme.

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN: So many reports have appeared that organising the unorganised sector of workers is a very difficult job. Also to work among them is also difficult. The Government of India has also accepted that position. In that case, will the Government consider issuing railway passes to important leaders, all-India organisation leaders at least, for going round the country and organising the unorganised sector of workers in the country? It is reported that it is very difficult to organise the unorganised sector including the agricultural workers and to fight for their cause.

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: Sir, as I said, all these passes will be considered on a case-to-case basis. Any suggestion which the hon. Member has, he is certainly welcome to pass on to me and it wil be considered on its merits.

*325. [*The questioners (Shri Mahendra Prasad and Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare) were absent. For answers* vide *col.* 35-36 infra]

Accebtance of the recommendations of the National Commission of Self-Employed Women and Women Workers in Informal Sector

*326. SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRAVARTY:

SHRI ASHOK NATH VERMA:†

Will the Minister of HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT be pleased to refer to the reply to Unstarred Question 118 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 22nd February, 1989 and state:

(a) whether the recommendations contained in the report of the National Commission on Self Employed Women and Women Workers in the Informal Sector have since been considered;

(b) if so, the details of the recommendations accepted and those rejected by Government; and

(c) the action taken by Government for the implementation of the recommendations accepted?

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Ashok Nath Verma.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS AND WOMEN AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA): (a) to (c) The recommendations of the Report of the National Commission on Self-Employed Women and Women in the Informal Sector are under consideration of the Department in consultation with the concerned Ministries/ State Governments.

श्री अशोक नाथ वर्मा: यह रिपोर्ट सन 1987 में पेश की गयी थी। सभापति जी, मैं आपके द्वारा मंत्री महोदया से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि राज्य सरकारों को रिपोर्ट कब भेजी गयी और इन राज्यों से जवाब उन को कब मिला ?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: The Commission, known as the Ela Bhatt Commission, was set up in January 1987. Eversince we received the report, one year after that, we have been in constant touch with State Governments and other Ministries. It is true that our department is the nodal department, but we cannot implement any of the recommendations. We can only refer them to the concerned departments, Ministries and State Governments and organisations and we have to get them to implement them part by part.

I would like to tell the hon. Member that out of the 253 recommendations which were made in this report, 54 have been incorporated in the National Perspective Plan itself as recommendations to the different departments. About others we are in consultation with the State Governments and other Ministries. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: We are aware that the Government's interest in women's affair is only skin-deep, which is very obvious. It is nothing more than that. Otherwise the answer given by the Minister is such that it has to consult various Ministries and the State Governments etc. I would like to ask the Minister as to how many of those recommendations could have been implemented by her own Ministry, how many of them could have been implemented by other Ministries and how many of them could have been implemented only in consultation with the State Governments. If that be the case, why is it that the Government has not attempted to accepted such recommendations which have been implemented by her Ministry or by the other Ministries? I do understand that it is a collective responsibility, it is an integrated Government and, therefore it should not be very difficult for the Ministry to get convinced or convince other Ministries. If they fail, then there is something wrong with it. Therefore, I would like to ask what is the reason for not implementing such recommendations which could be implemented by other Ministries and then what specific efforts have been made to consult the State Governments, accepting the need for consultation, and what has been the response of the State Governments and which State Governments have not responded?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: To begin with I must say and I want to repeat that these recommendations on women in the informal sector cannot all be implemented by us. As I said what we found were of importance, have been incorporated in the NPP and have already been sent for further follow-up action. But I would like to tell him, since the hon. Member has asked about State Governments...

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: I asked about your Ministry, other Ministries and then the State Governments.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: You have asked for three. I am saying that what can be done by other Ministries has been referred to the other Ministries for follow-up action and they are supposed to implement, not me. We can only have some follow-up. One of the recommendations which has been made, for instance, is that there should be a monitoring cell in the Planning Commission to deal with women's programmes, which has already been approved and is being implemented. In this sense a number of recommendations have begun already to operate in various Ministries and departments from the commission's report. I am not saying that nothing has been done, but I do not have here with me for all the 253 recommendations a report on how many and who has implemented what. It will be just a question of months now that we have started really working on them.

As far as the other point is concerned, we have referred the whole report itself to the National Commission on Rural Labour so that they would also look at the recommendations and incorporate them in a comprehensive manner in their report for follow-up action. Besides that, the hon. Member asked about the State Governments. The State Governments and Union Territories from where final replies have been received are: Delhi and Lakshadweep are the only two to give final replies. Interim replies have been received from West Bengal, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Goa, Daman and Diu, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir, Nagaland and Sikkim. Not yet from Andhra Pradesh.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Mr. Chairman Sir, this report is a valuable document and it concerns two issues. One is the promotion of self-employment and the other protection of women in the informal sector. Now, so far as self-employment is concerned, I appreciate that it is increasingly becoming a visible agenda of the Government. Wage employment will not increase very far. Now, the Minister is correct that all the implementation does not belong to her Ministry but the problem with the Government is that such schemes are compartmentalised in such a way that it had almost become fragmented. Now, the Minister of Human Resources is responsible. The Minister of Rural Development is responsible. The Minister of Industry is responsible and her Ministry is responsible. Is there some way to pool all the resources and all the programmes and give it a thrust, a time-bound thrust for the implementation of self-employment for women. That is (a). (b) : so far as incidence of exploitation is concerned, throughout the informal sector, it is a common story and more so, so far as vulnerability of women is concerned, whether it is the urban or the rural economy. Now, there the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Social Welfare have a responsibility. Is there a common agenda emerging between the Ministries to look after this problem on a priority basis? That is number of my supplementary.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Sir, one of the recommendations that we from our Department have made is that there is need for greater coordination of women's programmes and one of the things that we have agreed on now is that there would be coordinator for women's programmes at the district level and an office would be specified as the coordinator for women's programmes, no matter which Ministry is implementing them so that there is a common thrust at the district level.

Sir, as far as the informal sector is concerned, it is true that an overwhelming number of women are self-employed and are in small, not projects but they earn their living by

work in the informal sector, very often at home and on their own. It is difficult to generalise but the hon. Member would probably be aware that in all the rural development programmes and poverty alleviation programmes, we are now ensuring that a minimum of 30 per cent beneficiaries should be women whether they are bank loans, whether it is under TRYSEM or whether it is under other progammes for distribution of assets to those under the poverty line. In this way we hope that we will be able to enlarge the participation of women in Government programmes for poverty alleviation.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is all about the informal sector and employment for women. Is the hon. Minister aware, and if she is ought to be because I have written to her about it, that in Rajasthan women cannot hold land when unmarried on the ground that they are daughters, and they cannot hold land when married on the ground that they are wives? I wrote to you on the subject about a month ago saying that this is a very unacceptable situation and it is part of the Rajasthan Agricultural Land Ceiling Act. Has the Government considered this matter? If it has not, why? What are you going to do to remove this situation? It is a completely unacceptable situation as far as the State of Rajasthan is concerned.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: What about Haryana, Sir? There is a move....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are asking a supplementary. Not now. Sit down.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Sir, this is State legislation.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Please, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Put your suppletary also with it.

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER): Sir, I would submit that it is a matter of clear information to me that in a State as a part of the law it has been laid down that a daughter or married woman cannot have property, agricultural land in their names. This is something astonishing.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I just want to add infomation, Sir. About a month ago, I wrote to the hon. Shrimati Margaret Alva, giving a note on this subject and I have pleaded with her that they must be taken into account. I come from Rajasthan. I do not have a daughter..... (*Interruptions*).,

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, if the assumption of the hon. Member is correct, then it is a very very serious matter. I would ask of the Minister—he is a distinguished lawyer—is such a position tenable in law?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, my question also relates to this.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Sir, my colleague informs me that sometime back, Mr. Jaswant Singh had written a letter to her and she wrote to the State Government and informed them that this is not a proper thing that is there and therefore, they must let us know what the situation is. It appears that she has not been able to receive back any information. But I would personally go into it. I will talk to the Chief Minister myself and find out whether it is a part of law. If it is a part of the law, it is abominable according to me and we have got to take steps in spite of the fact that it might be a State subject. We will do whatever is at our command to see, that this type of abominable provisions do not exist.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, my question actually is on the same terms as what my colleague Shri Jaswant Singh said. Today, the newspapers say that there is a move

by the Haryana Government asking Parliament to amend the Hindu Succession Act. The Cabinet of Haryana has taken a decision, a shocking, retrograde and reactionary step to ask Parliament and the Central Government to amend the Hindu Sucession Act so that daughters are denied a share in the family agricultural property. I am just framing my question. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Frame your question.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Let me frame the question. It is such an important issue and you must forgive me if I am a little emotional about it. Sir, the Hindu Succession Act was amended in 1956 to give women an equal share in the property and even then, there is one part of it which denies them a share in the ancestral property. Now, there is a move by the Haryana Government to have that amended in its application to Haryana to deny women a share in the agricultural property in their family and only giving them a share in the property in their in-laws house and out of this, two things arise, Sir. One is, a women has to get married. Otherwise, she won't get any share in the property. This, I think, is a terrible imposition. The second thing is, even if she is married, supposing, they want to deny a share in the property to the... (*Interruptions*)...Sir, in Haryana, we all know what happened even in the Chief Minister's house. They just killed a woman. So, you kill her, you kill her share to the property. I won't ask the hon. Minister what is her reaction to this and what steps they are going to take with regard to this. I would also ask for a Short Duration Discussion.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Sir, I have read this news this morning and I am equally shocked and I associate myself with the hon. Member. But I am sure, none of the Members sitting on the other side would ever support this type of a move.

SHRI MOHINDER SINGH LATHER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Member has referred to a move from Haryana. I would like to say that this is not the first time that such a move has been thought of. Sir, there have been cases in which there have been murders between brothers and sisters. There has been bad blood between them on account of their rights in the property.... (*Interruptions*)...When a daughter is married ... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: He is defending his father-in-law.

SHRI MOHINDER SINGH LATHER: Why don't you listen to me? I am giving you my point of view. My submission is, the position is very clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Put your question.

SHRI MOHINDER SINGH LATHER: The Haryana Government is only requesting Parliament to create ownership rights for a girl when she goes to her in-laws. because it will stop bride-burning when she will be the owner of the property. (*Interruptions*). My question is, this thing has not yet come, it is not yet finalised. Then, why is this matter being raised now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your question, please?

SHRI MOHINRER SINGH LATHER: My question is, will the Government consider this? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: May I have a word to clarify the situation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is there. He will put his supplementary.

SHRI MOHINDER SINGH LATHER: Let me say... (*Interruptions*) They are making an issue out of of it. They have brought Haryana into this. (*Interruptions*). I am only asking whether the Government will consider to create ownership rights for females in the in-laws' family instead

of the daughter's family because it will avoid creation of bad blood between brother and sister?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Sir, I am surprised to have an... (*Interruptions*)...hon. Member of this House to stand up and defend the move. Perhaps, in a way, this has been in keeping with their tradition because earlier, the late Mr. Charan Singh had said that women should not be given jobs, they should stay at home and do only household work and they should not be given jobs. (*Interruptions*). This has been their stand on women's issues at all times. But, Sir, I do want to tell the hon. Member that none of us is going to be a party to a move where you deny a women her rightful share in the property in her family. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Sir,... (*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Let me finish my answer. Then you can ask. I want to tell the hon. Member this. He speaks about bad blood being created because of girls getting married and going. Don't men get married and also have bad blood over property and kill each other? Why is it that only when women come into the picture they get exasperated? (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Baby. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: ...anti-social attitude. The whole House must condemn. It is very important. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI M. A. BABY: Mr. Chairman, Sir,... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: The entire Cabinet including the BJP is approving it. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI M. A. BABY: Sir, I would like to know from the Minister... (*Interruptions*).

श्रीमती सत्या बहिन : सभापति महोदय, सबसे ज्यादा अत्याचार महिलाओं पर हरियाणा में हो रहे हैं। ... (**व्यवधान**) ...

श्री सभापति : यह क्वेश्चन आवर है, मजाक नहीं है। बैठ जाइये।

SHRI M. A. BABY: Sir, there had been some instances reported in Kerala where the lands allocated as part of the land reforms measure in Kerala had been sold out by husbands, by the male, as the land is registered in their names only. So, the Government of Kerala has issued directions and it has been announced in the Assembly also that the land will be registered in the names of both the husband and the wife. This has been done in Kerala. Has the Minister taken note of this fact and has the Minister proposed to give similar directions to other State Governments also so that the status of women can be protected to some extent?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I would like to tell the hon. Minister... (*Interruptions*). Sorry, Hon. Member. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: It is a question of time. Only four months.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is only four months away. Then he will be a Minister and she will be a Member.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You have already come to that mood now. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY:...We have got forty years. Don't bother about it.

SHRI M. A. BABY: I do not propose to become a Minister.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I would like to tell the hon. Member that in this very House, during the Budget Session of Parliament, the Prime Minister announced that in

future all transfers of assets from the Government, whether under the Poverty Alleviation Programme or Surplus Land Programme or House Sites Programme or Indira Awas Patrikas would be in the joint names of husband and wife. This announcement has been made and directions are being issued to all the State Governments in this regard. (*Interruptions*).

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Have you noted what has been stated by her and what has been the question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: She has answered it.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, some of the things which have been stated on the floor of the House today would shock the conscience of a man if man has conscience. What has been said on the floor of the House would shock the conscience of a man if he has a conscience. Women, in the year of the Lord 1989 are treated like chattel. One Member says that ownership rights cannot be given to a woman in agricultural property in one State. Another gentleman argues that giving ownership rights in the agricultural land is likely to create bad blood. Every property creates bad blood. It is being argued that they should not be given a right in the property. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, if this is the approach which the State Governments are going to have treating women like chattel as it were, whether she willing to amend the Constitution so that we are able to protect the rights of women as they need to be protected and not leave them to the tender mercy of the States. Sir, it is not only reactionary. It is not only retrograde. It is inhuman. It is barbarous. Enough words cannot be found to condemn it.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Sir, my friend has referred to the powers of the Parliament. Parliament is supreme and I am sure that no section of the House would ever support this type of approach which has been referred to by the hon. friend on the other side. Nobody will support him. I am sure his ranks themselves will not support him.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Sir, the Andhra Pradesh Government has passed an Act providing for equal rights for women in patesual property. (*Interruptions*). This is very important. They passed an Act and they wanted the Centre to amend the Hindu Succession Act. The Prime Minister has refused to amend the Hindu Succession Act. Can they deny that? When the Andhra Pradesh Government asked that the Hindu Succession Act should be amended to provide equal rights for women, the Prime Minister is on record as having refused to do that. Can they deny it?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: First you deal with your friend in Haryana. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: First you deny it. First you say whether the Prime Minister is on record as having refused to amend the Hindu Succession Act on the pattern of the Andhra Act.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I must submit that for the first time in the year 1956 the Hindu Succession Act was passed. (*Interruptions*). What is this gentleman talking. Why does he not sit down? Sir, have you permitted him to speak? (*Interruptions*). Have you permitted him to speak? Will what he is talking go on record? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: The entire country knows that the Prime Minister refused.... (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 327.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Whether it is a fact that the Andhra Pradesh Government has passed a law to amend...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have called Question No. 327. That is all.

Soviet President's Offer for Reduction of Nuclear Arms

*327. DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY: Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention was drawn to the news-item regarding statement made by Soviet President in an address in France to European leaders; to reduce Soviet nuclear arms unilaterally; whether the West has agreed for immediate negotiations to take reciprocal steps in regard to such weapons;

(b) if so, whether Government consider it as a step forward in the realisation of a nuclear weapon free world as contemplated by the Prime Minister; and

(c) what steps have been taken by Government to evoke favourable response from the Western countries to the said Soviet proposal?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): (a) to (c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) Government has seen the USSR President's address to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, delivered at Strasbourg on the 6th July, 1989. The Soviet President stated, *inter-alia*, that it was time to begin talks within Europe on tactical nuclear systems between all the countries concerned and that if the NATO countries appeared ready to enter into negotiations on this subject, the USSR could make further unilateral cuts in its tactical nuclear missiles in Europe, without delay.

According to the Final Statement issued at the end of the last NATO Summit on the 30th May, 1989 negotiations on achieving "a partial reduction" of US and Soviet land-based, short-range nuclear forces "to equal and verifiable levels" can only begin once the implementation of an agreement on conventional force reductions in Europe is underway. The Statement also mentioned that no negotiated reductions in short-range nuclear forces, below the existing level on the side of NATO, would be carried out until the full implementation of the conventional force agreement.

The Soviet proposal for the elimination of all short-range nuclear weapons is, indeed, a step forward towards the objective of the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons, which constitutes the core of India's Action Plan on Disarmament unveiled by the Prime Minister at the Third Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

India is utilizing all available international fora and other opportunities for seeking the widest possible acceptance of its proposals under the Action Plan, which include the elimination of all short-range nuclear forces.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : माननीय सभापति जी, पूरी शताब्दियों के इतिहास में 19वीं शताब्दी का इतिहास सबसे अधिक रक्त रंजित कहा जायेगा, क्योंकि इस सदी में दो महायुद्ध हुए, जिनमें 58 लाख लोगों की जानें गयीं। मान्यवर, परमाणु हथियारों की होड़ यदि सम्पन्न राष्ट्रों में जारी रही तो एक ऐसा भयानक दिन भी इस धरती पर आ सकता है, जब सारी मानवता का नामोनिशान इस धरती से मिट जाये। भारत ने इस स्थिति को दुनिया में सबसे पहले पहचाना और भारत के प्रधान मंत्री माननीय श्री राजीव गांधी ने 9 जून, 1988 को यूनाइटेड नेशन्स जनरल असेम्बली के तीसरे विशेष अधिवेशन में परमाणु निरस्त्रीकरण पर जो प्रस्ताव रखा, उसकी सारी दुनिया में प्रशंसा की गई। मेरे प्रश्न के उत्तर में माननीय